



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,388	06/20/2003	Daniel M. Wong	OI7011293001	8538
23639 7590 03/14/2008 BINGHAM MCCUTCHEEN LLP Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4067				
EXAMINER JACKSON, JENISE E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2139				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/14/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/600,388

Applicant(s)

WONG ET AL.

Examiner

JENISE E. JACKSON

Art Unit

2139

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 14-19, 21 and 26-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9-12 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 14-19, 21 and 26-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date "SEE CONTINUATION"
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 14-19, 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernstein(5884,316) in view of Mallory(6126328).
3. As per claims 1, 14, 26, Bernstein et al discloses establishing a session on behalf of a user(see col. 4, lines 33-40, 59-67); receiving a request to enable database privileges for the user(see col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 6, lines 24-36); upon receipt to the request to enable database privileges(see col. 6, lines 24-36) verifying trusted security logic has been previously executed, wherein the act of verifying the trusted security logic includes verifying a proxy user(see col. 4, lines 24-53, col. 6, lines 37-50); and enabling database privileges for the user if the trusted security logic has been executed(see col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 6, lines 24-36).
4. Bernstein is silent on verifying trusted logic by checking a call stack. Mallory discloses verifying trusted logic by checking a call stack(see col. 18, lines 36-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include checking the call stack of Mallory with Bernstein, the motivation is that checking the call stack is a way to evaluate whether a valid pointer to a context structure is found execution proceeds(see col. 18, lines 48-63).
5. As per claims 2, 15, 27, Bernstein discloses storing call information in one or more

frames of a call stack(see fig. 3 sheet 4); and wherein the act of verifying includes determining whether the one or more frames of the call stack corresponds to the trusted security logic(see col. 4, lines 40-50).

6. As per claims 3, 16, 28, Bernstein discloses wherein the act of verifying the trusted security logic comprises verifying an application name(see col. 5, lines 1-26).

7. As per claims 4, 17, 29, Bernstein discloses wherein the act of verifying the trusted security logic further includes verifying a security function name(see col. 6, lines 24-36).

8. As per claims 5, 18, 30, Bernstein discloses wherein the act of verifying trusted security logic comprises verifying a module name(see col. 6, lines 24-36).

9. As per claims 6, 19, 31, Bernstein discloses collecting one or more session parameters; comparing the one or more session parameters against a set of trusted security parameters defined in a security function; and returning a result indicating whether the one or more session parameters matches the set of trusted security parameters(see col. 6, lines 36-50, 62-67).

10. Claims 8, 21, 32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernstein(5,884,316) in view of Mallory(6126328) further in view of Fisher(6092189).

11. As per claims 8, 21, 32, Bernstein nor Mallory disclose receiving information identifying the user; prompting the user for a password; authenticating the user based on information stored in an application program; and associating the user with a role. As per claims 8, 21, 32, Fisher discloses receiving information identifying the user; prompting the user for a password(see col. 15, lines 42-44); authenticating the user based on information stored in an application program; and associating the user with a role(see col. 15, lines 45-51, col. 31, lines 30-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include receiving

information identifying the user, prompting the user for a password, authenticating the user based on information stored in an application program; and associating the user with a role of Fisher with Bernstein, because database security is maintained through the control of access to the database tables by the DBMS. Data that is considered privileged can be protected from access by those persons or programs that should not see it(see col. 39, lines 54-67 of Fisher).

12. Claims 9-12 are allowable for the limitations enable database privileges for the user if the trusted security logic is contained in the one or more frames of the call stack.

Response to Amendment

13. The Applicant states that Bernstein does not disclose verifying trusted security logic by checking a call stack is not disclosed in Bernstein, and new art has been applied to amended feature Mallory(6126,328). Mallory discloses a procedure ExamineContext(i.e. security logic) is called by execution to host control code to obtain information pertaining to the execution of a code module in the execution engine. Procedure ExamineContext receives parameter module name, indicating the name of the code module being executed by the execution engine, and parameter param_req_ptr. Param_req_ptr is a pointer to a context structure instantiated by a previous call to execution interface. The pointer to the context structure(i.e. call stack) is evaluated to determine whether a valid pointer is found(see col. 18, lines 36-63).

14. The Applicant states that Bernstein does not disclose verifying trusted logic has previously been executed by verifying a proxy user. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. Bernstein discloses a function call from a client that is intercepted by a proxy. The interface pointer from the client is an interface pointer structure that includes a proxy object known as a

virtual function table(see col. 4, lines 33-40). Vtable pointer that points from the interface pointer structure to the vtable object. Vtable is the proxy object that is a table of pointers to each specific member function implementation(see col. 4, lines 40-52). The vtable pointer that points from the interface pointer structure to the vtable object(see col. 4, lines 24-53, col. 6, lines 37-50).

Final Necessitated by Amendment

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENISE E. JACKSON whose telephone number is (571)272-3791. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex time, but generally in the office M-Fri(8-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. E. J./
Examiner, Art Unit 2139

February 29, 2008

/Matthew Heneghan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2139